

## Responses to Comments in Letter 147 from Andre Vitalis, Surrey Resident

*Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond to the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.*

1. Please see Letter 9, Response to Comment 5 for a discussion of the BACT process and how it is applied to the proposed project.

2. The location of the facility is based on size, proximity to available utilities and gas pipeline easement, compliance with City of Sumas zoning and comprehensive plans, access to the site, and availability of the property. In addition, the Washington Administrative Code states:

*“When a proposal is for a private project on a specific site, the lead agency shall be required to evaluate only the no action alternative plus other reasonable alternatives for achieving the proposal’s objective on the same site.” (WAC 197-11-440 (5)d).*

Air quality impacts are discussed in detail in Letter 3.

3. Visibility issues were evaluated as part of the Draft EIS. Please see Letter 49, Response to Comment 7 for a discussion of visibility issues related to the proposed project. In addition, the visibility of cooling tower plumes was evaluated in the Draft EIS. The analysis concluded that visible plumes would be of short duration and would not obscure visual resources in the area. The plume analysis also indicated that plume-induced ground-level fog would be very infrequent and icing was not predicted for any hour during a five-year model simulation.
4. Please see Letter 5, Response to Comment 9 for a discussion of potential noise impacts associated with the proposed project.
5. Air quality monitoring is proposed for the project. Please see Letter 134, Response to Comment 5 for a discussion of emissions monitoring for the proposed facility.
6. The comments concerning cooling tower design are noted.
7. The abatement measures noted by the commentor have been incorporated into the design of the facility. Please see Letter 5, Response to Comment 9 for a discussion of several noise abatement measures that have been proposed for the facility.
8. Please see Letter 147, Response to Comment 2 (above).